



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,990	01/30/2001	Anna Pia Slothower	PALM-3559.US.P	4362

7590 06/08/2006

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JENNIFER T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/774,990	SLOTHOWER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer T. Nguyen	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to amendment filed 03/27/2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) Fig. 1 in view of Robsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,309).

Regarding claims 1, 9, and 16, the AAPA Fig. 1 discloses an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly comprising:

- a display mechanism (140);
- a digitizer mechanism comprising a top film (120) and a resistive digitizing element (130);
- a supporting structure (105) for supporting said display mechanism (140); and
- a cover (110) for the touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said touch screen assembly and that is coupled to said top film (120) to operate therewith as a single physical layer to allow mechanical transfer between the cover (110) and the digitizer mechanism (130) and is coupled to said touch screen assembly (140), wherein the resistive digitizing element can be activated by mechanical pressure applied to the external surface of the cover (page 10, line 11 to page 11, line 10 in supported specification).

AAPA Fig. 1 differs from claims 1, 9, and 16 in that it does not specifically disclose the cover is a single piece cover enclosure that encloses the top and sides of touch screen assembly. However, Robsky teaches single piece cover enclosure (24c) encloses the top and sides for a touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses a top film of the digitizer mechanism (28c) to allow mechanical transfer between the single piece cover (24c) and the digitizer mechanism (28c) (fig. 9, col. 3, lines 17-40, col. 4, line 67 to col. 5, line 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the single piece cover enclosure as taught by Robsky in the system of the AAPA Fig. 1 in order to protect the digitizer mechanism device.

Regarding claims 2, 3, and 17, the combination of the AAPA Fig. 1 and Robsky teaches a single piece cover enclosure is constructed using in mold decoration (col. 3, of Robsky, lines 17-40).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, the AAPA Fig. 1 further teaches finger pressure on the external surface of said single piece cover enclosure can be used to activate said digitizer mechanism (page 10, line 11 to page 11, line 10 in specification).

Regarding claims 5 and 12, the combination of the AAPA Fig. 1 and Robsky teaches wherein stylus pressure on the external surface of said single piece cover enclosure may be used to activate said digitizer mechanism (col. 1, lines 10-63 of Robsky).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of the AAPA and Robsky teaches wherein said single piece cover comprises a mylar polycarbonate material (col. 3, lines 17-40).

Regarding claims 7, 14 and 20, the AAPA Fig. 1 further teaches the soft thermoplastic film has sufficient deflection under external pressure to active said digitizer mechanism (page 1, lines 15-20 in specification).

Regarding claims 8 and 15, the combination of AAPA Fig. 1 and Robsky teaches the single piece cover enclosure (24) for the display mechanism and said digitizer mechanism is

constructed with a flat outer top surface free of any indentation (Figs. 1-10 of Robsky, col. 3, lines 17-40, col. 4, lines 13-67).

Regarding claims 10 and 19, the combination of AAPA Fig. 1 and Robsky teaches said single piece cover enclosure is a soft thermoplastic outer film that is coupled to said top film of said digitizer mechanism that is coupled to the supporting structure (col. 3, lines 17-40 of Robsky).

Regarding claims 13 and 18, the AAPA Fig. 1 further teaches the digitizing element of said digitizer mechanism is a resistive type digitizing element (page 10, line 11 to page 11, line 10 in specification).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments filed 3/27/2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because as follows:

In response to Applicants' argument stated "structure 24 only partially encloses components of the touch screen assembly that is disclosed by Robsky et al. and is not coupled to act as a single physical layer..." Examiner respectfully disagrees because AAPA Fig. 1 teaches two layers (110 and 120) acts as a single physical layer (see in response to arguments of last Office action). Robsky teaches a single piece cover enclosure (24c) encloses the top and sides of touch screen assembly (Fig. 9). Therefore, it is believed that the ground of the rejection is maintained.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2629

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7696. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer Nguyen
6/3/06



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600